## THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

STATE OF GEORGIA

IN THE MATTER OF: STATE ELECTION BOARD HEARING

2 MLK JR. DR. SE SUITE 810 WEST TOWER ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334

JANUARY 22nd, 2020 9:00 A.M.

PRESIDING OFFICER: BRAD RAFFENSPERGER

SECRETARY OF STATE

STEVEN RAY GREEN COURT REPORTING, LLC Kaitlin Walsh, CCR, CVR-CM-M

Atlanta, Georgia

## APPEARANCE OF THE PANEL FROM LEFT TO RIGHT Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger, chair Rebecca Sullivan, vice chair David Worley Anh Lee ALSO PRESENT IN ORDER OF PRESENTATION Ryan Germany

## PROCEEDINGS

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Good morning, everyone. We'll go ahead and start. First of all, the invocation, and I'll do that. Okay.

(Invocation)

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: If you all will stand for the Pledge of Allegiance, on your left -- my left, your right.

(Pledge of Allegiance)

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Well, before we get started, I just want to -- we will be having a new board member joining us at the next board meeting. He's been nominated by our Lieutenant Governor, Jeff Duncan, and that is Matt Mash -- Matt Mashburn, if you want to stand up? He'll be joining us, but he has not been sworn in yet, so in the interest of following protocol, we'll be waiting for that event to happen, and so that should happen. He'll be ready for the next SEB meeting that we'll have.

I guess right now we can look at the last board meeting -- approval of our board meeting minutes. We've had those in our folders. Hopefully, everyone has had a chance to review those. If you review them, if there's -- now would be an appropriate time for a motion.

MS. SULLIVAN: I'll make a motion -- I'll make a
motion to approve the minutes.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second?

Second. 1 MR. WORLEY: 2 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: I have a first and a second. All those in favor --3 4 THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 5 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: -- please signify by saying aye. THE BOARD MEMBERS: 6 Aye. 7 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Motion carries. 8 Okay. So today we have time for public comments. 9 two minutes each, and we have lots of folks here, and what 10 I'll do to probably expedite this -- we are going to be 11 speaking, coming up to the podium here? MR. RAYBURN: We've got a wireless mic. 12 13 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. So we can have some folks 14 line up, and it will just probably expedite it all, just 15 because of the time. But number one we had was Ms. Hillary Holly, Ms. Liza Conrad, Ms. -- sorry, Mr. Andre 16 17 Fields, Mr. James Woodall, Mr. George Balbona. The first five can just come and line up, and then following that 18 19 will be Bjorn Cole, Dr. Jasmine Clark, and John Peterson, 20 but to give you a order. So Ms. Hillary Holly? 21 MR. RAYBURN: Make sure you hold the mic up, and 2.2 please state your name and where you're from. 23 MS. HOLLY: Hello. My name is Hillary. I'm from Atlanta. So 2020 is an important year for Georgians. 24

are electing a President, US senators, state

25

representatives, and many local elected officials. I'm here this morning to raise concerns on behalf of Georgians and ask the State Election Board and the Secretary of State to do its job and prepare for the 2020 elections.

2.2

So Georgia is attempting to implement an entirely new voting system during a presidential election year. The Elections Board should do everything in its power to ensure that Georgians who choose to vote from the comfort and privacy of their home can do so rather than stifling third parties that are dedicated to increasing voter participation. Requiring absentee forms to be substantially in the same form as the Secretary of State's application creates an unnecessary burden to the applicant and does not solve a legitimate problem.

If and when election systems fail, the onus should be not on the voter. Poll workers must be equipped and required to offer voters provisional ballots and redirect them to the proper precinct location if practical. Given that this new election system will be unfamiliar and confusing to Georgia voters, the section directing poll workers to be -- verbally instruct every voter to review their ballot and alert the poll worker if any changes need to be made provides clarity and helps ensure every vote is counted and should not be removed.

The state is expecting record turnout at the polls in

2020, so the Elections Board should be following the guidelines of HB316 for the required number of voting machines in the precinct. For instance, some of these rules are not in compliance with HB316, such as saying if this allows polling places to be used instead of precincts, it allows for the double counting of early voting machines for election day. When requiring the number of electors at the precincts, the calculations shall provide a minimum of at least 1 voting booth or enclosure of each 250 electors therein a fraction or thereof.

And before I wrap up, I would be remiss if I did not call out the absurdity of misleading Georgians inside of Ebenezer Baptist Church on Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s holiday. He was a champion of voting rights, and this has — and this Board in particular has taken advantage of the undoing of one of his most cherished legacies, so to stand in the pulpit and declare Georgia's voting system is an objectively fair — is an absolute disgrace. And then, we are good. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. So your name?

MR. WOODALL: Yes. This is Reverend James Woodall,
State President of the Georgia NAACP, resident of Atlanta,
GA. I stand here today to declare that our votes, our
election system, our election process here in the state is

not secure. The Secretary of State's Office and members of this State Election Board has gone across the State of Georgia, communicated with NAACP chapters, and taken pictures with them, put them on Twitter and Facebook and Instagram, telling them to smile and to say that they believe that their votes are secure. As the State President of the Georgia NAACP, we have committed to working with the Secretary of State's Office to ensure that we can do all that we can do to make sure that our votes are secure, and it's unfortunate that the Secretary of State's Office has decided to take this route.

2.2

2.3

However, we are -- continue to support working together and to communicating to ensure that our votes are secure, that our people, our communities feel secure. But unfortunately, that is just not simply the case at this present moment. Rural and metro counties alone, I mean, both alike have not received all their voting machines. Here we are, less than 90 days until an election, and they have not received the information, the equipment, and the training necessary to conduct an election.

We just had a situation down in Athens, GA just yesterday, where there was some suggestions that maybe a waiver could be processed that removes the ratio from machines to voters. That's unacceptable. And so, our support -- our support remains with the people of this

commun -- with the community that we serve, and again, we say that our votes are not secure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

We've also submitted written comments about the proposed rules. The rules are vague, quite frankly, do not have an intelligible response to what it is that units and organizations alike are able to do, and so we're asking that there be clarity about the primary purpose of what these rules are asking us to do because unfortunately, right now that's just not simply the case. There are several typographical errors that are included in the rules, which make it way much more difficult for us to actually implement those in practice. And so, if a regular person, not even an attorney -- but if a regular person -- matter of fact, if an attorney can't understand what the purpose of those rules are, then there is no -there's no way in the world that a regular intelligible person would be able to decide. And so therefore, we ask for there to be a review and a rejection of these rules until there is clarity as to what the rules actually mean. So again, I stand here and conclude with this: our votes are not secure. We're not happy, and we're willing to work with the Secretary of State's Office to make sure that that does happen. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Mr. Balbona?

MR. BALBONA: Hi there. George Balbona, concerned

citizen. I have here -- and I'll give you copies for the record -- a letter from Marian Schneider, the President of Verified Voting, in which she says Verified Voting did not recommend that Georgia purchase all ballot-marking devices for all in-person voters. She also says, quote "to express or imply that doing an ROA pilot demonstrates the security of the system is simply not true."

2.2

Here's something else I find interesting. This was sent to you, emailed to you on December 16th, and it says, "I hope that you will share this letter with your Council and your communication staff." We have the last Secretary -- State Election Board meeting the next day, and you didn't mention this. I'm sick of having the Georgia Secretary of State's Office cherry pick their sound bites, okay? You were very happy to post a incorrect [sic] quote from her, but when she corrects the record, you don't mention it in the State Election Board meeting. You also don't mention it anywhere on your website. I know I hit the good points. All right.

I emailed all 159 county election supervisors, and I'm noticing a very disconcerting trend. I asked them what equipment they have received. A lot of them haven't received anything, but more disconcerting is the ones that they have -- a trend that I'm seeing is they're not receiving their UPS's, their uninterruptible power

supplies. This is going to be the power cords all over again. Get on it now. You need to be able to plug in all of the six tons of equipment that is not secure.

2.2

Last but not least, Jordan Fuches, our Deputy
Secretary of State, she went online and on the official
Deputy and Chief of Staff's Facebook page and said some
unflattering things about Marilyn Marks. She specifically
said, "drop your frivolous lawsuit. Stop getting our team
for Georgia off task. Get out of our way." She later
deleted this. By the way, that's a felony -- the public
record. If you don't believe it, look up 45-11-1. I
think she needs to be dismissed, at the very least,
although I would love to see her do 10 years. I think you
don't go get that happy hour and then go disparage people
on an official website. Unacceptable. Drop the mic.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Mr. Bjorn Cole and Dr. Jasmine
Clark will follow, followed by John Peterson, Dana Bowers,
if y'all could come up. Mr. Bjorn Cole?

MR. COLE: So I'm Bjorn Cole, citizen around here, just live across the way in Oakland. So last -- for the gubernational election 2018, my wife and I both voted in the Butler Street Church, and I went to -- actually, I went to early vote, different site, relatively short times there. She at the -- at the main day for the gubernational election was an over an hour wait in order

to vote, and I know that was one of the shorter lines in kind of the metro area and in other sites. The reason I rise to comment today is to suggest or request -- I see there's provisions for emergency ballots to be provided, ballots that are on the same level as if you were to use the machines. I would like to request/suggest that a wait time on the order of half an hour, maybe an hour, is sufficient to allow a local county official or precinct official to deploy emergency ballots in order to open up more voting booths and shorten the lines, so that's on the -- on the waiting point.

2.2

2.3

The second one -- for security, so I do a lot of software development for federal government as a contractor. One of the methods that we use to help audit and to be sure that the right version of software is loaded is to basically calculate a signature based on the contents of the source code of a given piece of software. I believe it would also be good for auditing and to assure the public that software loads on the machines are known by being able to correlate the signatures of what is loaded on a given machine to a master copy from the vendor or vendors of various machines. And with that, I'll go ahead and end my comment. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Representative Jasmine Clark.

MS. CLARK: Good morning, Mr. Secretary and members of the Board. I come to you today as a State Representative from House District 108 and also a Georgia vote from the Lilburn area. So I'm here to strongly object to the proposed rule 183-1-13-.01, which is the minimum number of voting booths rule. This rule gives permission to counties to create long lines by withholding equipment for some or all precincts. Last session, my colleagues and I in the General Assembly passed legislation that says that you must have one voting station per 250 active voters in a precinct. proposed rule subverts that and could lead to selective disenfranchisement. Studies show that con -- studies consistently show that black voters in Georgia stand in line nearly twice as long as white voters on average. This rule could bolster this undesirable issue for our voters. How much equipment you deploy and how many e-poll books and how many voting booths and how many scanners makes a difference in how long voters will have to wait, and high turnout elections such as what we're going to experience in 2020 during peak hours, voters will have to wait in lines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

I'm not suggesting that it is your job to make sure voters never have to wait to vote, but it is your job to make sure that every polling place is properly equipped

for the number of registered voters, and it is your job to make sure that we prevent undermining legislative intent. The proposed rule would allow counties to deploy as few as one voting station in a precinct on election day and still be in compliance. One election director has already confirmed in writing that she will deploy only one machine per 500 voters on average but won't commit to what that means per precinct, so I submit that this rule needs to be stricken. The law gives clear direction and does not need further clarification. The legislature decided to give voters across Georgia equal access to vote and that decision should stand. Thank you.

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. John Peterson?

MR. PETERSON: Good morning, Mr. Secretary, members of the Board. My name is John Peterson. I'm a Georgia voter from Cherokee County, and I'm currently attending Georgia State University here in Fulton County. Last month, I shared my concerns about ballot secrecy, and as far as I can tell, nothing at all has been done to fix this problem. Ballot secrecy is absolutely guaranteed in the Georgia Constitution. It is also required by the Help America Vote Act, and the law that enabled ballot-marking devices says that they must permit voting in absolute secrecy so that no person can see or know any other elector's votes.

Georgia's election boards are required to conduct elections in such a manner as to quarantee the secrecy of the ballot, and it's absolutely clear under the law that Georgia ballot secrecy is not optional, and yet, here we are, months after pilot elections revealed the new ballotmarking devices have a terrible design flaw that allows anybody in the room to read the screens from 20-30 feet away. They're huge. The new tablets are big, they're bright, and they stand upright. When you choose a candidate, a bar lights up across the screen, and anyone familiar with the ballot can easily tell the candidate selected from a distance. Anyone, poll workers, poll watchers or observers, or other voters, can see exactly who was chosen by voters, and the counties that are waiting for the Secretary of State to solve the problem have not heard anything from you about what you're going to do to fix it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

If there is a solution that can be deployed before in-person voting begins in six weeks, I'd like to hear it. Why are we about to deploy 33,000 ballot-marking devices that aren't able to protect the secrecy of our votes? During your recent meeting, one election board member asked her attorney are we supposed to follow the Constitution or the State? Which law are we supposed to break? And putting elec -- election board members in that

position is disgraceful. You should not be in a position as an official of the government to have to choose which law to break because superiors of yours have chosen not to follow the Constitution. You spend most of your time meting out penalties for those who do not follow the law, so what's your answer for her, for all election superintendents? Which law do they break? I ask you to halt the use of the ballot-marking devices until a solution can be implemented that will guarantee the security of our ballots, and I urge you to add a phrase guaranteeing the voter's right of secrecy to the ballot to rule 183-1-12-.11, conducting elections. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. We next have Dana -Dana Bowers, Caroline --

MS. HOLKO: Holko.

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. Isabella Gambino and Libby Seger, so Ms. Dana Bowers?

MS. BOWERS: Hi. Good morning. My name is Dana Bowers, and I'm a Georgia voter from Gwinnett County. Georgia is predicted to see a record number of voters in the November election. With pre -- with a President and two Senators to elect, political ads will be flooding the airwaves and our social media pages. It will be hard to ignore that -- this election year. How and where equipment is deployed will make a difference in whether

voters are able to cast their ballots without unreasonable wait times. The legislature mandated one voting booth for every 250 registered voters in a precinct. The Secretary of State adjusted the initial purchase after reviewing voter registration trends and other data so that counties will actually receive one BMD system for every 255 registered voters. This lets them set aside some -- some for early voting and still meet the one in 250 standard for precincts. Or will they?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

With State help, every county is reviewing each of the 2 -- 2700 polling places used across the state to make sure they have the space and the electrical capacity to house the BMD systems. Hundreds of polling places -- no one has the exact number yet -- cannot fit the mandated number of voting booths or there aren't enough electric circuits. You can only put 6 BMD systems on a 15-amp circuit or 8 BMDs on a 20-amp circuit. It's too late to change polling places for the March election, so local boards have -- have a dilemma. Do you have one standard for some polling places and another for the rest? some voters find more machines and shorter lines, while others find fewer machines and longer lines? This is exactly what the legislature hoped to avoid when they set a minimum of one voting booth for every 250 voters, yet here we are. You know what wouldn't cause this trouble?

Hand marked paper ballots. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. Caroline?

MS. HOLKO: Hi. Good morning. My name is

Caroline Holko. I'm a candidate in House District 46, and

I'm a voter in Cobb County. One of the things that is

very concerning to me is there doesn't seem to be a clear

consensus on what constitutes the actual vote. It's

defined -- federal law requires an answer. I want an

answer. Cobb County wants an answer. Georgia wants an

answer. Proposed Rule 183-1-15-.02, definition of vote,

removes references to DRE votes but includes only one

minor reference to BMD ballots, what to do in case of

stray marks.

But the larger question is: is our vote the human readable portion of the printout or is it the QR code? It's defined differently in two different places. One of the concerns that I have about using the QR code for anything: I have an app on my phone that allows me to change where a QR code points to. I'm a suburban housewife, and I can change QR codes, so I'm really concerned about the possibility that anything other than the human readable portion of the ballot would constitute the vote, so that is my ask to you is that you make sure that the human readable portion of the ballot is officially defined as the vote in the event of an initial

vote, a recount, an audit, anything. I can't read a QR code. I can't even learn how to read QR codes because I am not, in fact, a cyborg, so please, please, make the best decision, protect our votes, and make sure that the process is 100% transparent and clear. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Ms. Gambino?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MS. GAMBINO: Yes. Good morning. My name is Isabella Gambino. Can you guess which component of the new voting system created the most trouble during pilot elections? The e-poll books, which failed in nearly every pilot precinct at the start of voting on election day. The problem was not solved in all precincts for hours and only after a Wi-Fi reset of their data. And which component of the old voting system created the longest lines and tens of thousands of voter complaints in November 2018 elections? The e-poll books, which checked in many voters promptly, yet lost others and returned the wrong precinct for many voters. The electronic poll books tried to send Representative Jasmine Clark to another precinct, but she stood her ground, pointed out that the MVP page showed she was in the correct precinct and was finally allowed to vote after a lengthy delay.

State law required a certified electors list be available in every precinct to be used as needed when the e-poll books don't work as intended. The certified

electors list has robust standards. It must be updated after early voting is complete, include information about who has been sent an absentee ballot, and checked for accuracy, then certified by at least two of the registrars. Had the certificate -- had the certified electors list been consulted immediately, it's likely Representative Clark would not have endured a long wait to cast her ballot. You -- your proposed rules refer to paper poll books or similar phrases. We urge you to add certified electors list to Rule 183-1-12-.02 definitions and note that all references to paper poll books are deemed to mean certified electors lists, specify that certified electors list shall be deemed the official record in case of a conflict with the e-poll book. Preventing unnecessary provisional ballots and longer lines depends on it. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Ms. Libby Seger?

MS. SEGER: Good morning. My name is Libby Seger,

and I am a voter for Fulton County. I am also a student

at Georgia State University, where I am the President of

the Young Democrats and currently cofounding a Fair Fight

Action chapter. I represent the future of this state. I

am the rising generation of Georgia voters. This year

will be the first time that a lot of my peers and I can

vote in a Presidential election, and our right to a safe

and secure election is something that we're taking very seriously.

2.2

2.3

I've been watching the roll-out of this new system unfold, and I'm astounded about what I see and in the worst way. I cannot believe that Athens County Clarke, which is home to the largest university in the State, won't receive their equipment until February 3rd, even though the primary election begins in just two weeks with mailed absentee ballots, not to mention that Gwinnett County, along with several others, still haven't had their equipment delivered yet either. Additionally, last week only a handful of counties had received their election management server and the software required to make ballots and test equipment. Do you know that the contract required all counties to have their EMS systems by January 20th? That was two days ago. My classmates are better at hitting deadlines than that.

Everyone knew that it would be difficult to implement a statewide roll-out of this magnitude with so little time. That's why it was ordered that the State develop a backup plan and test it during the November pilot elections. The Cobb County hand-marked paper ballot pilot election went smoothly with very few reported problems, unlike every other pilot election. Some -- some say that there were problems with the hand-marked paper ballots as

well like people checking the bubbles instead of shading them in, but those are just a few instances that affected only a handful of voters and most likely -- and most importantly, it was easily solved. There are issues with the new voting system that could affect entire counties and that are not easily fixed. The State also says the roll-out schedule for this was fluid, but you know what schedule is not fluid? Election day and all of the critical dates that come before it, so the emergency ballot pan [sic] in your proposed rules is not a substitute for a real plan to run smooth elections. Georgia deserves better. The question is will you do better? Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Brava.

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Ms. Laura Digges, and then after, if we'd start lining up, Aileen Nakamura -- Nakamura, Shea Roberts, Liz Throop -- Troop -- and Jean Dufort, and I apologize if I mispronounce your names.

MS. DIGGES: Thank you. Good morning.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Ms. Laura Digges?

MS. DIGGES: Hi. Good morning. My name is Laura Digges. I'm a Cobb County voter. There are few things worse than having a uniform set of rules so badly written than they cannot be followed uniformly. The new emergency ballot rules are well intended. The emergency ballot

rules create options for poll managers, supervisors, and superintendents, the folks out in the field on Election day, to change the voting procedures when the uniform system is not working properly. This is a very good idea. The problem is these rules are inconsistent and vague. Who makes the decision that an emergency exists? The rule generally says the superintendent, which is the election - I'm sorry. I have nerve damage in my hands, so my hands are shaking. The -- yeah, please hold it because I've got nerve damage.

2.2

The problem is these rules are inconsistent and vague. Who makes the decision in -- that an emergency exists? The rule generally says the superintendent, which is the election board, except where it says as -- it says it's at the discretion of the election supervisor, which is the election director. If neither can be reached, the poll manager may act. How do you prepare for an emergency? By having a sufficient number of paper ballots on hand as determined by the superintendent. What is sufficient? Election directors tell us that some say it's 5% of registered voters. Some say 35%. The choice could make the difference between some voters experiencing long delays or being unable to vote if there is a systemic equipment failure, as happen -- happened during the pilot.

It appears that the emergency must be tolerated for

30 minutes before emergency rules can be implemented, and the rules don't state when or if the poll manager can revert back to the uniform procedures. Some even interpret the rule to say that 30 minute wait times for any reason constitute an emergency, but that can be a normal condition during peak hours in a big election, and they do not address what to do if it's the electronic poll books causing the problem. We encourage you to make plans to improve these rules within the next few weeks, so that they will provide the critical guidelines needed by election directors before early in-person voting begins. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Ms. Nakamura?

MS. NAKAMURA: Good morning. I'm Aileen Nakamura, a Georgia voter from Sandy Springs. Public observation of elections build trust and helps ensure that election outcomes reflect the will of the voters. Public observers include groups like Election Protection, the ACLU, and ordinary citizens with an interest in our elections. Georgia's nearly 2500 polling places serve anywhere from a few hundred voters to more than 25,000. To comply with Georgia law, election officials must set up polling places to ensure both voter privacy and allow public observation. With the new voting system, protecting voter privacy means protecting both the voting station where you make choices

on a tablet and print it out and the scanner where you cast your vote.

2.2

2.3

Current rules prohibit public observers from getting within 6 feet of the voting booths, but Georgia statute 21-2-267 states that every polling place shall consist of a single room, every part of which is within the unobstructed view of those present therein. The ballot box and voting booths shall be so arranged in the voting room within the enclosed space so to be in full view of those persons in the room outside the guardrail or barrier to permit the public to observe the voting without affecting the privacy of electors as they vote.

However, during pilot elections, I observed a precinct where elections officials set up check-in in one room and voting booths in another, illegally blocking observation and another precinct where the entire gym was deemed the enclosed space and public observers were not allowed inside. This cannot be what was intended. Your new definition of enclosed space may be interpreted to allow an elections supervisor to declare that anywhere that a voter may mark a ballot, carry that ballot, and scan the ballot is within the enclosed space and off limits for public observation. There's an easy solution. Direct the Secretary of State to supply and require use of secrecy sleeves like this to protect the ballot from

printer to scanner, specify to the -- sorry -- specify that the guardrail or barrier must be stanchions or floor tape -- not solid barriers to allow visual observation and clarify for local election supervisors that the enclosed space should be expressly limited to the areas within 6 feet of voting booths and scanners. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Ms. Roberts?

2.2

2.3

MS. ROBERTS: Good morning. My name is Shea Roberts. I'm an attorney and candidate for State House District 52, and I'm a Georgia voter from Sandy Springs. I have to ask y'all, have you really looked at the ne -- new ballot-marking tablets? Have you seen them in use? What kind of certification testing missed the glaring design flaw that the votes cast on them can be observed from 20 to 30 feet away? They literally do not comply with the law. It says electronic ballot-marking devices must permit voting in absolute secrecy so that no person can see or know any other electors' votes. Why are we shipping 33,000 of them to counties and expecting to use them in March elections when we know they fail at the most basic level to comply with our laws.

As a candidate, it's personal. While canvassing, I have met voters who assure me they will vote for me but are adamant no one else can know that. It's a swing district thing. I think most Georgians take our right to

a secret ballot for granted, and we shouldn't do this. It's a right guaranteed in our Constitution and backed up in our statutes. Ballot secret [sic] is also required federally through the Help America Vote Act.

2.2

2.3

In many ways, the State Election Board is the compliance arm for our election system. Nearly every time you meet, you hear cases where some election official or another did not follow the law, and you mete out consequences. How can you just sit back and watch these non-compliant machines roll out to counties and into voting booths? What will you do when a voter files a complaint that her right to a secret ballot was taken away when she was forced to use one of these new ballot-marking tablets? It's a serious problem deserving of a serious answer. What say you?

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Ms. Throop?

MS. THROOP: I have visual aids. I'm Liz Throop. I live in Dekalb County. I spent over 30 hours observing the new voting system and speaking to voters as they left the polls. I asked them if they read their printouts and about half said that they could read it only with difficulty. One SEB proposal says poll workers shall tell voters to review their ballot and tell them that magnifying devices are available. It says that voters shall review their printouts. None of this addresses

whether voters can review their printouts in any meaningful way.

When type is hard to read, it's extremely hard to find errors. The Democratic party suggests type be bigger, 12-point Ariel, but the type isn't just small, it's far too close together. The printouts used in pilots have less than 80% of normal line spacing. The space from line to line can be increased if you use legal-sized paper, and the Dominion printers and scanners accommodate that.

A member of the State Commission said, in session, if we provide the voter with a paper ballot of what they've done, and they don't take the time to look at that and verify, there's really nothing we can do. That's the voter's responsibility. Blaming voters does not relieve this body of responsibility to address the readability of the printouts. Verifying printouts is the only hedge offered to mitigate erroneous results. Unverifiable ballots cannot lead to claims of accurate elections. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Ms. Dufort?

MS. DUFORT: Good morning. I'm Jean Dufort from Madison, Georgia and from Morton County. Across the State, most Georgia counties enjoy true citizen oversight of elections through the appointment of election boards.

Some oversee both elections and registrations. Some just oversee elections. The rules that govern election boards require appointment of most members -- certain members by major parties and others by another governing body, often the County Commission. We just heard today you were appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, citizen boards. This balance, particularly the political balance, as to public confidence in our elections. The people have a voice in their election boards.

2.2

2.3

Georgia law confers on the local elections supervisor, the election board, important rights and responsibilities for the conduct of elections. For example, the superintendent is charged with guaranteeing ballot secrecy and with certifying election results.

Currently, the elections superintendent is defined basically as the county board of elections or in some counties the judge of probate court. Separate from the elections superintendent, the elections supervisor is a staff position with primary responsibility for election operations and is accountable, in most cases, to the election board.

As a citizen who believes in public oversight of elections and as Vice Chair of the Morton County

Democratic Committee, I oppose the revision to Rule 183-112-.02, which adds election supervisor to the definition

of superintendent, conferring power to a paid staffer normally reserved to the citizen board. While I appreciate the hard work done by elections supervisors — some of them are here — I firmly believe that the ultimate authority and responsibility for the conduct of elections must remain in the hands of election boards. County Republican and Democratic committees alike should oppose this dilution of their power and advocate for the peoples' right to oversee elections. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. If we could have next Nannette Vaughn, Joy Wasson -- Wasson, Adam Hinchliffe --

MR. HINCHLIFFE: Yes, sir.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: And Greg Aikens and Robert Smith, line up. The first one will be Nannette Vaughn. Joy Wasson? Ms. Vaughn?

MS. VAUGHN: Good morning.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Good morning.

MS. VAUGHN: My name is Nannette Vaughn. I'm a
Georgia voter from Brookhaven in Dekalb County. Every
Board of Elections this month has had to face the truth:
that the March presidential primary election will be
underway before they meet next, and very few counties have
the equipment needed to conduct that election. Overseas
and absentee ballots go out first week of February. The
election management systems are running woefully behind;

very few counties have received theirs. With no EMS system, the central server and programming that you need to program ballots and test your equipment, you cannot complete preparations. A draft poll worker training manual just went online last week, yet it's incomplete, and without a complete manual, you cannot properly train workers.

2.2

Today, the State Election Board is meeting with plans to modify many of the proposed rules after considering our public comments. After this meeting, the revised rules will be posted for another 30-day public review. If the revised rules are accepted next month, Georgia law requires 20 days before they are effective, so early voting will be well underway before there are official rules for elections using the new voting system, and the design flaw in the voting tablets which we've heard about within 20 feet of -- visually being able to see, we don't have a solution in sight for that, so it's unfair to the people who run elections in 159 counties, their directors, and local boards.

Judge Totenberg ordered the hand-marked paper ballot pilots so the State would have a backup plan in the event their plans to implement the new system by March went awhy [sic] -- awry. I would ask that you consider that backup plan. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Ms. Wasson?

2.2

MS. WASSON: Good morning. My name is Joy Wasson, and I'm a Georgia voter from Dekalb County. I'm the kind of person who likes details, and I like to research and plan and do things in an orderly way. For me, watching the roll-out of this new election system was like fingernails on a chalkboard. It's painful, and it feels so unnecessary. The Secretary of State chose the low-cost bidder, whose quality score was mediocre. The vendor committed to delivery by end of March, then simply to satisfy the customer said we'll try to get most of the equipment to Georgia by the end of December. Looks like the customer isn't always right, and Dominion was truthful about its capabilities from the start.

So where do we go from here? The March presidential primary actually begins in two weeks, when UOCAVA and absentee ballots go out. Deliveries are running behind and precious weeks of election preparation have been lost. To implement a new system well, you need more time to prepare, not less. Who will make the call? When is the last day that counties, including some major counties, can receive equipment, test it, train workers, and conduct the election? The law contemplates individual counties making that decision, a very hard decision.

Just last night, the Athens-Clarke County Board of

Elections went on record saying that they are prepared to leave most of the equipment in the warehouse and use hand-marked paper ballots if things don't improve. They are not scheduled to get their equipment until February 3, and a preliminary assessment of polling places shows that many cannot house the number of voting stations required by law. They are not prepared to disenfranchise their voters. Will you give the counties any guidance or stand with the Secretary of State when he insists that things are running ahead of schedule even when it's quite clear that they are not? Head-in-the-sand is a terrible way to run a state-wide election.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Brava. Brava.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Mr. Hinchliffe?

MR. HINCHLIFFE: Good morning, Mr. Secretary and members of the Election Board. My name is Adam Hinchliffe, and I represent the Center for the Visually Impaired, and we're located in Midtown Atlanta. Just a brief description of CVI. We're Georgia's largest, fully accredited, comprehensive rehabilitation facility. We serve all levels of vision loss and all age groups. The reason why I'm here this morning is CVI is committed to ensuring that our constituents, many of whom are blind or visually impaired, are prepared to utilize the new voting technology that will be presented for this and future

elections.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

One of the things that we examine is that there are a couple of areas, some of which you've heard about, but in a different way -- the printed portion of the paper The one concern that we see is while it's true ballot. the barcode scanner is obviously not readable, but the written portion of the text of the ballot choices above, where most sighted people could read the ballot, people with low or no vision would not be able to do this. ask you -- and we know that you are considering rules that would consider allowing independent screen reading technologies -- some of which are on phones, others are independent devices -- to be considered so that Georgian -- Georgia voters who are blind or visually impaired can securely cast their ballot, independently, securely, and to make sure that the official printout which we understand would be the official ballot represents their electoral choices.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for allowing me to speak and please know that the Center for the Visually Impaired is committed to helping in any way to ensure that Georgia voters who are blind or visually impaired can cast their ballot accessibly, securely, and independently. Thank you very much.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Mr. Aikens?

MR. AIKENS: Good morning. My name is Greg Aikens. I'm a voter from Dekalb County. I'm also a member of the National Federation of the Blind of Georgia, and I also rise to raise concerns from the blind community in Georgia about the accessible -- the accessibility of the new voting system. As Adam mentioned, one of our major concerns is the ability to confirm the ballot that has been printed out, that it is marked as we asked, but we also have concerns about the usability of the system that was chosen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

While it technically meets the definition of accessibility in that it will read the screen out loud to -- to someone who is blind and visually impaired who cannot access it visually, it is not easy to use. These concerns have been shared with members of the Secretary of State's Office since before the Dominion devices were chosen. They were shared again in November at a demonstration that it's confusing, it's not easy to use, that the audible instructions are challenging, so I -- my question would be what is being done to address that with Dominion? It's things that can be changed, but will they be changed to make -- make instructions more clear, easier to use? Will you provide a way for voters who are blind and visually impaired to independently confirm the ballot that was printed out? Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you, sir. Mr. Robert Smith?

2.3

MR. SMITH: Good morning. My name is Robert Smith. I'm a voter from Fulton County and a member of the National Federation of the Blind of Georgia. I too, as the one who has gone before me, am concerned about the verification of the paper ballot in that you do have the capabilities of scanning your driver's license or state ID. Why can't this be done when you complete your voting and give in your paper ballot for verification? I think the technology exists, so why don't we use this? And that's my concern, and I won't go over my time, but I just wanted to -- you all to know that this is a concern in the blind community. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Next would be Ms.

Marcia Robinson, Bently Hudgins, Ms. Helen Butler, Ms.

Penny Poole, Edgardo Cortes, Ms. Janine Eveler, and I know
I read off a lot of names, but Ms. Marcia Robinson and

Bently Hudgins, Helen Butler.

MS. ROBINSON: Good morning.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Good morning.

MS. ROBINSON: My name is Marcia Robinson. I am a Fulton County voter in Georgia, as well as I am a board member of the National Federation of the Blind of Georgia. My colleagues have already eloquently stated all the

concerns we have about the accessibility of the voting machine. I will say that I was one of the testers that actually tested the Dominion machine when you were making the decision about what machine you would choose, and at that point, I stated emphatically all of the concerns that we've stated here today, but that machine was still chosen. So going forward, my concern is that again, the accessibility for the printout when it's printed.

2.2

However, -- and I appreciate the fact that you are looking at ways to use new measures in which to scan the ballot by using our electronic device which could have an app that could read that. However, we have many people that are blind or visually impaired who do not use smart phones, who do not have an app on their phone. Some of them still use flip phones, so the question arises again: how are they going to read the ballots when it's printed out? I hope that this will be of utmost importance to you and that you would find some decision that would make our right to vote accessible for everybody. Thank you.

MR. HUDGINS: Hey, everybody. Good morning. My name is Bently Hudgins, and I'm a voter in the State of Georgia, recently moved up from Macon up here to Atlanta, and I'm happy to be here. Thanks for having us. I just

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Mr. Bently Hudgins?

want to commend the comments that were made earlier about

the concern of previous wait times, the lack of equipment, and just the lack of clarity surrounding the proposed rule changes, particularly around 183-1-13-.01. There are several concerns about the lack of consistent application of the new House Bill 316 around making sure that there is enough machines of one per 250 voters. There is a lack -- additional lack of clarity around House Bill 316 for voter purges.

2.2

But one -- there are a couple of things that have not been raised that I would like to speak to you about today. One, there are elections happening right now. The rules changes that we're talking about are -- and the lack of action is affecting, you know, current elections. And additionally, so, as a part of the organization that I work for, we've contacted over 4 million voters. We've registered hundreds of thousands of voters, right? And part of our work, we were able to get to know and be a part of communities down in southwest Georgia.

Last year -- November we know in Georgia is hurricane season, right? When the hurricane struck communities across South Georgia, many people weren't able to vote. I am encouraged by the attempt to clarify what deserves to be considered an emergency situation, particularly in 183-1-12-.02. There is an emergency definition, but like people have said before, that definition is vague, and

it's not sufficient to meet the needs of Georgia's voters. So before another hurricane season happens and as storms are getting worse, we're going to see a lack of access to the ballot just because of bad weather, and so what are we going to do as a State when folks are physically barred — so I just want to thank you for your time, and I hope you do the right thing.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Ms. Butler?

2.2

MS. BUTLER: Good morning. I'm Helen Butler,

Executive Director of the Georgia Coalition for the

Peoples' Agenda convened by Dr. Joseph Lowry, and being in

the civil rights arena, one of the things that we are most

concerned about is protecting that right to vote for all

citizens. I won't be redundant. You have our written

comments with regards to all of the rules, which we think

are vague and not available for us to really implement

this fully, but what I've heard today is that we don't

seem to be ready for this election cycle. But one thing I

do know that I've heard that there are people that are

planning to reduce the number of early voting days.

There are plans for people to reduce polling locations and because we have a new voting system, we should not limit access for voters, so our concern is that a) early voting days remain the same -- the same number. It shouldn't be reduced because we're not ready with the

implementation of the new system. We shouldn't have to change polling locations because of this new system.

2.2

2.3

We should make sure that our facilities can accommodate anything that we implement in place but not limit the access of voters, so we're really concerned about that and want to make sure that you promulgate rules to the local boards of elections that they have to follow and make sure that voters have access -- total access to the ballot and that if -- they are not made to drive inordinate amount of distances to get access to that ballot. So that is our primary concern today, in addition to the things that we've already submitted in writing to you with regards to the rules. So thank you very much for considering those changes.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Brava.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Ms. Penny Poole?

MS. POOLE: Good morning. My name is Penny Poole.

I'm President of the Gwinnett NAACP. Firstly, in

conjunction with state law 21-2-285 and in conjunction

with the NAACP State President James Woodall and

Gwinnett's State Representative Jasmine Clark, I have

concerns. I attended the Gwinnett Board of Registration

meeting on last night, and as of 1/21, Gwinnett County has

not posted early voting, absentee ballot, or in-person

voting instructions or notices for the citizens of Gwinnett. And secondly, during the reporting period last night, Elections Supervisor Christie Rostin, she announced that satellite polling places will be decreased from 19 to 12 voting days for the presidential preferential primary, as well as the May primaries.

2.2

2.3

Democratic Representative Steven Day asked, who made these decisions because the Board was not involved or informed or did the Board make these decisions. And then secondly, a citizen asked, why not use paper ballots as was decided by Judge Amy Totenberg instead of creasing —decreasing access to the citizens. Supervisor Rostin's answer was — and she refused to answer either. Her response to these questions were [sic] that these decisions were made because they were not sure when machines will arrive or if they will be on time, and her second response was that she stated that polling workers were still not properly trained to operate these machines for the citizens of Gwinnett.

Gwinnett County has announced illegal elections decisions without the consent of the Gwinnett Board of Registration and Elections. Secondly, Gwinnett County will cause massive voter disenfranchisement because they are suppressing the right of citizens to have equal access to the ballots and to cast their votes. We are

immediately asking for this Board to resolve why Gwinnett has chosen to take this into their hands illegally and make decisions for the Board of Registration and Elections. We would like this to be done immediately, and we, the NAACP of Gwinnett, we demand a written response to this.

## MR RAFFENSPERGER: Ms. Eveler?

2.2

MS. EVELER: Good morning. My name is Janine Eveler, and I am the Director of Elections in Cobb County, and the local election officials do have concerns about how the Board is going to interpret the one unit for every 250 voters. I would just like to reiterate that the code section that you're trying to interpret does say for each precinct and not for each polling location, and I would take care in how that is administered.

We do have concerns about the logistics of getting the number of units that are being discussed in each of the polling locations. The code section 21-2-367, which is what is being interpreted that, again, does speak to precinct, was originally written prior to the advance voting that we have today, and it wasn't taken into consideration that we are offering to every precinct multiple days, multiple weeks, and multiple units in other voting locations during advance voting. I would appreciate that those offerings would be taken into

consideration in some way in the rule.

2.2

Also, different election types have different turnout, and I can appreciate the desire for what the legislature was trying to do for general elections, specifically to have the maximum number of units out there that we could, but for instance in the presidential primaries, Cobb County has never had more than a 48% turnout and 8% of that at that time was early voting. So if we're going to the 250 -- for every 250, that maxes out every unit that we've been allocated, and I have a hard time putting that many units out when we're only going to have less than 50% probably turnout. I think we should be able to consider historical turnout and the type of elections and let the rule account for different types of election turnout. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. Edgardo Cortes?

MR. CORTES: Thank you, Mr. Secretary, members of the Board. I am Edgardo Cortes. I'm an Elections Security Advisor with the Brennan Center for Justice. It's a law and policy institute focused on justice and democracy issues. Also, though, former Commissioner of Elections in Virginia and a former local election official. The Brannen Center along with Common Cause on behalf of Common Cause Georgia did provide some more extensive written comments with recommendations for how to strengthen and

clarify the proposed rules, but I do want to highlight a couple of things.

2.2

There's been a lot of discussion around the -- the number of machines allocated per precinct. We definitely think that the language that's in the proposed rule is unclear and could lead to some of the bad outcomes that have been discussed today, and so, providing, you know -- taking out of the equation, dealing with advanced voting and early voting out of the equation for planning for election day I think would be appropriate.

The other thing I wanted to focus on was the issue of both emergency ballots and provisional ballots. The rules state that a number of -- that a sufficient number of these ballots should be provided. We would recommend that there would be more -- clearer guidance provided to local election officials about what that means. We generally advocate for having two to three hours' worth of peak voting in terms of backup ballots and provisional ballots.

In Georgia, based on the last few elections, you're looking at an average of about 35%, so having either the two to three hours of peak voting for each local to do it based on their specific locality or a blanket 35% threshold for the number of emergency paper ballots to have on hand and provisional ballots to have on hand we think would help strengthen the efforts that you have to

prevent long lines from forming should the machines go down. And we do -- we are appreciative of the fact that the Board is having this discussion, discussing these proposals in an open and transparent setting. We think it's important to allow this sort of input as you're dealing with these tough election security and preparation issues, and we look forward to working with you as you move forward. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you. If we could have Gaylon Tootle and Susan McQuethy?

MR. TOOTLE: Good morning.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Good morning.

MR. TOOTLE: My name is Gaylon Tootle. I'm a Richmond County voter. I work for Walter Knopshin's Center for Independent Living. I'm a part of Rev Up Georgia, and I'm here with my colleagues from the National Federation of the Blind. We again -- I won't be redundant. We have expressed our concerns about the confirmation -- the confirmation of the ballot. We've heard a lot of different issues that seem to be going on with the voting system, and the picture looks bleak. And then, when you couple that with -- normally with mass confusion, normally what comes along with that is marginalization of vulnerable people in marginal populations. So it is imperative that we come up with a better solution for

confirming our ballots, and we, in the National Federation of the Blind of Georgia, we feel that there's a simple solution to that and that is by providing iPads or tablets at each polling -- scanning position so that we can verify our ballots. And when we say verify our ballots, putting it where the goats can get it, that simply means that we want to be able to read the ballot once we have printed it, and we can say okay, I voted for such-and-so, and it is here on this paper.

2.2

We understand that in this time that voter suppression, voter whatever you would like to call it -- we want to make sure that the process is accessible from beginning to end. Voting is a right and not only that, accessibility is the law. So let's follow the law, and, again, the National Federation for the Blind of Georgia, we're here to assist with this process because we care, and we want to exercise our right to vote in a clear, transparent, and legal way. Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you.

MS. MCQUETHY: Good morning. My name is Susan McQuethy. I'm a DeKalb County voter. My concern is with the burden on voters to have to verify that a machine recorded their votes correctly. These new ballot-marking devices add a whole new level to the voting process. A level that is unreasonable and in cases bordering on

impossible. Voters are expected to find errors on barcoded ballots that are in a completely different format from the machines, and that makes it cognitively challenging for many, many voters. As we've been hearing all morning, the summaries do not provide the full spectrum of choices, and they are printed in tiny, cramped font, so it is no wonder that voters take little or no time to go through this ordeal, and research proves that they don't.

2.2

2.3

In the recent University of Michigan study, fewer than 7% of voters took adequate time to notice deliberate discrepancies that had been printed on their summaries. In an April 2019 report, voters spent an average of 3.9 seconds to review printouts that summarized 18 contests. The design of this system puts the onus on poll workers to provide interventions to better ensure the security of the vote. The January 13th, 2020 letter from the Brennan Center to the Secretary of State's Office, as well as the Michigan study, suggests that verbal prompting be provided to the voter after the barcoded ballot is printed before they are scanned.

This means that more poll workers must be recruited, and that means more cost and more training. Is this part of the plan? Have you taken measures to mitigate this serious flaw in the new system? Are provisions in place

to fully fund this mitigation? Audits have no credibility if they're performed using unreliable data, and hacking of elections is still possible, and the chances of it are made worse if malicious operators know that so few voters are likely to notice errors. The security of our elections is on the line. I trust that you are committed to providing resources for the necessary interventions. Thank you.

## MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Thank you.

(Applause)

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Well, thank you for your public comments. For the last month, we've been working on the rules. They were posted after the last meeting that we did have, and I thought perhaps the best thing to do is to let our Chief Counsel, Ryan Germany, just get us up to speed with where we are, and take it from there, Ryan.

MR. GERMANY: Is this one on? Okay. Hello. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. Yeah, so since the rules were posted, we have received and reviewed public comment. Thank you. So since the rules were posted, we have received and reviewed public comment. The rules working group that — that this Committee set up met to talk about how we should proceed, so today I have a couple new rules to propose to the Board to post for public comment, and then, some amendments to the rules we

posted last time for your consideration as well.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: So as we've been discussing this, I think all the Board members are aware of this and many of the people that have reached out to us, because of the timeline that we're on, it's felt -- and I guess there'll be a motion at some point, but what seems might work best is to actually -- we would implement the rules that have already been posted, and then, obviously then they would then become the rules, but then we would consider amending those rules further to further tweak this and hone down the rules as we want them. And this, we do think that this will be a process that will take a few iterations, and we want to continue to improve elections in Georgia, and we want to continue to take input from all the key voters and stakeholders in the election process in Georgia.

MR. GERMANY: Yes, sir. That's what I recommend: that for certain rules that we have posted that we adopt them, and then, in addition to voting to adopt them, we vote to post the amendment -- the amended rules that I'm going to propose, and then, we'll come back in another 30 days and consider -- consider those amendments to the posted rules.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: So any comments from the Board
for -- general comments for the public or direct them to

Mr. Germany?

MR. GERMANY: And what I was going to do, Mr. Chairman, if it's all right with you --

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay.

MR. GERMANY: -- is first off, present the new rules for the Board to consider posting for public comment and then, I'll go through the rules that we've already posted, but --

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay.

MR. GERMANY: -- obviously, subject to the Board's
pleasure.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Proceed.

MR. GERMANY: Okay. The -- the first rule -- it's in your binders, I believe, back in tab 8 -- is a rule about assistive technology devices. This rule allows disabled electors who are entitled to receive assistance to use an assistive technology device to help the elector review their paper ballot prior to casting.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: It's actually tab 7.

MR. GERMANY: Tab 7, I'm sorry. Any -- so this basically clarifies that especially visually disabled voters can use their assistive technology devices to review their paper ballot and doing so would not be a violation of the general rule that prohibits phones or other technology use in the polling place. So I would ask

the Board to post that rule for public comment.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Does this bill -- this proposed rule come from input from the ADA community?

MR. GERMANY: This is based on the input that we've received from the ADA community that they've brought up today and also previously in demonstrations that we have done with that community.

MR. WORLEY: Mr. Secretary, I would make a motion that we post the rule on assistive technology devices.

MS. SULLIVAN: Second.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Discussion of this rule from the Board? Hearing none, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor of posting this new rule for assistive technology devices as presented, signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Those opposed? Motion carries.

MR. GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next rule in the following tab in your binders is a rule about recounts clarifying that now with a paper ballot system, recounts will be conducted by rescanning all the -- all the ballots, and it goes through how to -- the process that an elections supervisor should go through in doing recounts.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any comments from the Board? Do I have a motion?

MS. SULLIVAN: I'll move that we post the new rule regarding recounts for public comment.

MR. WORLEY: I'll second that.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. Do we have any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of posting the new rule for recounts, signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Those opposed? Motion carries.

MR. GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Moving forward to the rules that have already been posted, so I'm going to -- going to go through them kind of by chapter, so the first one should be the next page in your -- the next tab in your binder is the rules with the amendments that -- that I'm going to propose today. The first one is the rule, so 183-1-6. It deals with required activities for third party voter registration. The public comment brought forward some -- basically some typos in the -- in the posted rule, and so I would ask the Board that we repost the rule as amended to correct -- correct those typos. This is one -- unlike some of the later ones, I don't think it's critical that we adopt it. I think we just vote to repost, and then we'll consider it next month.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any comments from any Board members? Do we have a motion?

MR. WORLEY: I'll make a motion that we post for comment rule 183-1-6-.02(6) and rule 183-1-6-.02(7) for public comment.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second?

MS. LE: I'll second.

2.2

MR. WORLEY: As amended for public comment.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: As amended.

MS. LE: I'll second that.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any discussion on the motion?

Hearing none, call to question. All those in favor of the proposed posting of the amended rule 183-1-6-.02(6) and (7), all those in favor say aye.

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any opposed? Motion carries.

MR. GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next -the next rule is rule 183-1-12. This is one that I will
ask the Board to adopt the posted rule because it deals
with, I think, things that are critical to be in place
before voting begins, such as storage, transport of
machines, logic and accuracy testing, and polling place
set-up, etc. But what I'm going to go through now are the
amendments, so I'm going to ask the Board to adopt the
rule that we posted last month, and then, to post a new
rule that we will come back -- that basically amends that
adopted rule. So however you'd like to handle it when we

go through the amendments now --

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: I'd rather -- my preference would be to clear the deck, and let's approve it, and then, let's talk about the amendments if that's desirable?

MS. SULLIVAN: Sure. I'll make a motion to adopt rule 12 as originally posted.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second?

MR. WORLEY: I'll second that.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have any discussion on that? Hearing none, all those in favor of adopting the rule 18-3- -- 183-1-12-.01 as posted -- through 19 as posted, signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any opposed? Motion carries.

Okay. Now, Mr. Germany, your proposed recommendations?

MR. GERMANY: Yes, sir. And the proposed revisions are -- I'm not sure the tab in your binder, but it's the red line version, and these are based on the comments we received, and I do want to thank the people that commented. Some of them are bringing forward issues we missed such as typos, and so we're correcting those, and we're also making some substantive changes. The substantive changes we are making are -- I'll basically go through them, not all them, but the main ones.

So from -- some of the county election officials

raised the point -- and I will say on our rules working group is Lynn Bailey, who is the Elections Director for Richmond County, and she has put in so much time and effort, and I just wanted to call a moment to appreciate her, as well as she has sent these rules to other counties, and we have received comments from many counties to help us make these rules better including Ms. Eveler from Cobb County and many others, so I just want to thank the counties for their help in -- in getting these rules, as well as the other commenters.

2.2

The first change is making a slight change to the storage requirement to basically clarify that counties can store these machines in a manner that protects them from damage, so making it a little less stringent in terms of, you know, they don't have to store them in their original packaging like we said, but if they come up with another way that protects them from damage that that's sufficient.

The other change we are clarifying is there's some requirements in the posted rule that require things to be posted on a webpage, such as in this rule the logic and accuracy testing dates, and we're clarifying that that needs to be posted on the county election board's homepage so it's not lost, or if it's not available on a webpage, then -- if they don't have an election board webpage, then in a newspaper of general circulation or another prominent

location in the county. So we're clarifying that.

2.2

We're clarifying that we've received some comments about accredited poll watchers to ensure that accredited poll watchers can have the access that they are entitled to under the law, so I put some changes throughout to clarify that accredited poll watchers must be able to observe certain processes, where -- whether it's the setup process, election day voting, or -- or tabulation, but cannot interfere with that. There was some back-and-forth at the rules working group. There was a proposal to allow certain photography of certain things at tabulation, and I think Mr. Worley will speak to that after -- after this, after I go through this. But there was -- that's not included in this, but Mr. Worley can -- can bring that up.

One thing that we do add that's a pretty substantial change is from the emergency ballot situation. We're adding a clause based on a comment we received that for any primary or general election for which a state or federal candidate is on the ballot, a sufficient amount of emergency paper ballots shall be at least 10% of the number of registered voters to a polling place. That's to try to -- we're not taking out the requirement that a county provide a sufficient number, so a sufficient number may be more, but we're providing this basically as a safe harbor and some guidance.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: So as -- as a floor?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. GERMANY: Yes, sir. We're making some changes. One significant change we're making is based on the paper done by Matt Bernhardt with the University of Michigan that basically identified certain interventions that are helpful in making people review their paper ballot. as one commenter pointed out, the -- the real helpful intervention occurs after the printed -- the paper ballot has been printed and before it's scanned. previously we had posted that you need to be told to review your paper ballot at the beginning of the process. That study showed that really, it's more helpful after the paper -- after the ballot has been printed, so we're putting in a requirement that -- that each scanner has a poll officer stationed there. That was already required, but that that poll officer stationed at the scanner has to verbally remind each paper -- each voter to review their paper ballot, so we're putting that at that point in the process.

Let me see what else. Another change we're making to this is dealing with provisional voters. We're adding a requirement that -- you know, one thing that happens in provisional, when a provisional voter shows up, it can be complicated for them to decide what they should do, and it's a lot to put on a poll worker to try to basically

tell them what to do, so -- and that's kind of something we want because it's not up to the poll worker to decide whether their, you know, that vote should count. It's up to the registrar to determine that at a later process, so the existing rules I think adequately kind of update our instruction to let the voter know here's basically your options.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

What we're adding in this rule is that each polling place shall have an information sheet developed by the Secretary of State available for voters that basically describes the relevant law regarding a provisional voter, so, you know, especially if you're -- if you're registered in that county but you're not in the right precinct, if you can't get to your regular precinct, then your provisional ballot may be considered an out of precinct ballot, and the votes that you're eligible to vote for would be counted. But if you're registered in a different county, then your votes wouldn't count. And so then, a voter has to make that determination at the outset dependent upon when they moved, you know, if they moved after the registration deadline, they can go back to their previous county. If they didn't, they really can't, so the idea is instead of having a poll worker trying to make these sort of legal factual determinations, we'll develop something that poll workers will have available that they

can give the voter to try to assist them in making that determination. I believe that is the only -- that that's the final substantive change we're making.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any comments?

2.2

MR. WORLEY: I'd like to make some comments about the revisions that were made to this particular rule, and I believe there is one other revision in here that Mr. Germany didn't mention, but a provision was added that if a poll officer observes a voter attempting to leave an enclosed space with a paper ballot, they shall inform the voter of the consequences of not depositing it in the ballot scanner --

MR. GERMANY: That is correct.

MR. WORLEY: -- which is an important provision. I was a member of the working group that worked on these provisions that reviewed all of the comments that were presented, and I'd like to thank the other member of the working group, Mr. Germany, Mr. Rayburn, Lynn Bailey from Augusta, Ms. Sullivan, Ms. Fuches, and Mr. Harvey, for all of their very hard work on revising the -- or on drafting the original amendments and then reviewing the comments and making revisions. I think everyone operated in very good faith to try to reflect as many of the comments as were possible in the rules. This rule in particular I think does some very good things, and especially as it

relates to provisional ballots, providing uniform information to voters across the state so that they can determine whether they should cast a provisional ballot and what will happen when their provisional ballot is cast. That, I think, will provide very needed uniformity across all the precincts in the state on that.

There is one additional thing that I would like to add to these -- to these amend -- amended rules, and if the Board wishes, and we pass this rule as amended again for further public comment, at that point I'd like to make a motion relating to photography after the polls are closed. But -- but to sum up, I think these -- I think these revisions, amendments are very well thought out and necessary, and I support them.

MR. GERMANY: So do we want to, Mr. Chairman -- do we do these here from Mr. Worley's amendment and then we can decide and -- do you want me to kind of explain that provision, Mr. Worley or would you --

MR. WORLEY: No. I'll --

MR. GERMANY: Okay.

MR. WORLEY: I'll be happy to --

MR. GERMANY: Sure.

MR. WORLEY: -- explain it. One of the suggestions that we had to this provision of the rules was to specifically state that accredited poll watchers shall be

allowed to observe the process as long as it's in a manner consistent with the operation of the polls. A suggestion that we had was to add language that would allow accredited poll observers to photograph several parts of the paperwork in the poll after the polls were closed, including the provisional ballot recount sheet, the numbered list of provisional voters, and so, the purpose for that recommendation was that provisional ballots — that voters have three days to cure problems with their provisional ballots.

2.2

2.3

Right now, anyone who wants to assist the prov -- the provisional voters in reviewing those ballots can make an Open Records request, but they won't get that Open Records request until the time is expired for the voters to cure their problems. So by allowing accredited poll observers to -- after the polls are closed -- to photograph a list of the numbered list of the provisional voters, those entities, and those are usually the Democratic and Republican party, can go to those voters and assist them in information that they might need to cure their provisional ballot to make sure that that ballot is counted. And so, I think that's a very good idea, and so I wanted to add an amendment at the appropriate place.

MS. SULLIVAN: Mr. Worley, can you --

UNIDENTIFIED MAN: Can you please speak up?

1 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MAN: Thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: Do you mind?

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Yes.

MS. SULLIVAN: Mr. Worley, can you tell us where you're amending the rule and read that language to us, please?

MR. WORLEY: Yes. The rule --

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: What page?

MR. WORLEY: -- would be on page 19 of 33 at tab 10 of the book. It's an amendment to rule 183-1-12-.12

(a) (8).

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay.

MR. WORLEY: And I would just -- the amendment would add language after the existing section 8 to just say after the tabulation of results on election day as been completed, accredited poll watchers shall be permitted to photograph the tape of tabulated results referenced in section 1, provisional ballot recap sheet -- the provisional ballot recap sheet referenced in section 3, and the numbered list of provisional voters.

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: But it wouldn't just be -- as I read that, it's not just provisional, so it's the entire tape that normally gets posted on the, you know, --

MR. WORLEY: Right.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: -- precinct windows.

MR. GERMANY: The tape is posted on the door, so there's no issue with people -- anyone could photograph that. And I would say, I don't have an objection, per say. I would describe it as more hesitation, and the reason is poll watchers now in the statute are not allowed to use photography or review electors lists, so I think it's more a question of is this -- and I think so there's a question of well, if it's after the polls close, is that prohibition basically lifted?

Outside the enclosed space, I think there's no -never a prohibition is my understanding, so for instance
photographing the tape on the door would never be a
problem for anybody. Would -- this would allow the
accredited poll watchers of the parties and the candidates
-- so the Republican, Democrat, Libertarian parties and
then, if any candidates have accredited poll watchers -to allow them to photograph these things, and I think the
-- I don't have any objection to the reasoning that they
want to get that information sooner --

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: I understand.

MR. GERMANY: -- because those voters --

MR. RAFFENSBERGER: It's the first time that we've heard it today, but I know -- has the working group been

working on this one or is that...?

2.2

MR. GERMANY: We've worked on it. We discussed it on Friday. Lynn Bailey, from a county perspective, said she didn't have an issue with it because those documents are basically -- are basically public anyway, so it's kind of -- my hesitation is basically going from a place where poll watchers are not allowed to use photography to one where they would be. And again, I'm not -- I wouldn't say I object. I would say I'm hesitant about making that leap.

MR. WORLEY: Well, I -- I think the amendment as I've offered it makes it clear that this is to be done after the tabulation of results on election day have been completed. I'd be willing to revise it additionally by putting in language saying that -- or putting in a clause that adds the phrase outside the enclosed area to make it clear that they should review these outside the enclosed area.

MR. GERMANY: I think that documentation and verification would occur inside the enclosed area, and I'm not sure we want to change that, so it's really a question of do we want to allow that, and, again, it's just a kind of hesitancy.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: We're going to be back here in a month to revisit other rules. Can we post this as -- as

another one of those and then it would give us the time just to go back, have further discussions, and get everyone on board? Because I think the -- the rules that have been posted today, the amended rules, I think have buy-in from everyone. It's just that timing factor, so if we could just do that and revisit that. I'd feel most comfortable with that, and then, we would probably get additional public comment on that also at the same time, if that would be agreeable?

MR. WORLEY: Sure. Sure.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: So I guess stick with what we have right now, what's presented, and then we'll vote on that, and then, we would --

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: We can't hear you.

- MR. RAFFENSPERGER: -- consider to -- post this as
  another proposed amendment. Is that...
- MR. WORLEY: That would be fine or we can adopt it and still have it -- I mean, it still won't be final until we get some public comment on it and vote -- and vote on it again.
  - MS. LE: They can't hear.
- MS. SULLIVAN: You need to pull up your mic.
  - MS. LE: They can't hear in the back.
  - MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Well, when it comes back -- when
    it --

1	UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: We can't hear.
2	UNIDENTIFIED MAN: Please speak into your mic.
3	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: I'd rather keep it stand alone
4	just so that just because of the time factor, because
5	if it doesn't move forward and we want to take it out,
6	it's a reposting
7	UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: We can't hear. We can't hear.
8	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: We'd have to remove it down. I
9	guess the mic level is turned very low today.
10	MR. WORLEY: I'm perfectly fine doing it as a
11	standalone amendment.
12	MR. GERMANY: So I think the relevant action from the
13	Board would be post rule 12 as amended and then another
14	vote to post Mr. Worley's amendment, and we'll post them
15	separately.
16	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. Do we have a motion?
17	MS. SULLIVAN: I'll move to post rule 12 as amended,
18	as presented to the Board today by Mr. Germany.
19	MR. WORLEY: I'll second that.
20	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have any further
21	discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of posting
22	rule 183-1-1201 as presented by Ryan Germany, please
23	signify by saying aye.
24	THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
25	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any opposed? Okay. Mr. Worley?

MR. WORLEY: And I would make a motion to amend rule 183-1-12-.12, tabulating results, section (a)(8), to add language after "poll officials period" to state after the tabulation of results on election day has been completed, accredited poll watchers shall be permitted to photograph the tape of tabulated results referenced in section 1, the provisional ballot recap sheet referenced in section 3, and the numbered list of provisional voters.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Is that a motion?

MR. WORLEY: That's a motion.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second?

MS. SULLIVAN: Second.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of posting the amendment as presented by Mr. Worley, please signify by saying aye.

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. RAFFENBERGER: Any opposed? Motion carries. They will both be posted.

MR. GERMANY: The next rule is the one that we received the most public written comments I would say and also the one we probably had the most verbal comments this morning on. It's probably the thorniest issue to try to - to try to solve, and it's minimum number of voting booths.

So since we are now moving back to an optical scan

voting system, it basically resurrected a section of Georgia code that had a minimum number of voting booths in place when using an optical scan voting system. That section of code was enacted a long time ago prior to early voting, and the fact is, for instance in November of 2018 and as the usual decrease in general elections, about half of the total voters vote early. So what we're trying to do -- and I think the point of the code -- the point of the code section is not really -- you know, the ratio is not the issue. I think the issue is they don't want voters to have to wait in line, and having a sufficient number of machines is one way of going after that, but it's not, you know, it's not the ill that they're trying to pro -- the legislature is trying to prevent in my view.

2.2

So the rule we proposed was basically -- the rule we posted was basically to have to allow counties to consider the number of voting machines, ballot-marking devices, that they use on the last day of early voting to take into account that there's many more opportunities for voters to vote than just at their precinct on election day. I don't -- I don't think we received a single comment kind of supporting that rule. People raised the point that for -- for big counties that have a lot of early voting, which is a good thing, they can basically -- they wouldn't have to have enough voting machines on election day. Now, for 145

counties, they wouldn't have that issue, but, you know, we have -- we have counties of all sizes in our state.

2.2

The way the rules working group is suggesting to amend this is -- and also, we were concerned, and maybe Mr. Worley can speak to this, that basically the rule we posted would be -- would face legal challenge as to whether or not it sufficiently kind of -- in compliance with the statute. So the amendment that we're trying -- that we're proposing today is instead of counting the early voting machines and adding them to election day is defining the term electors as used in the statute to subtract the electors who have already voted. As Ms. Bailey pointed out this morning and Ms. Eveler from Cobb County also pointed out, that doesn't really help in smaller -- it doesn't take into account the reality that elections are different.

This year we're going to have a presidential preference primary, a general primary, a general primary runoff probably, and then a general election in November, and they'll all going to be different. The November election is going to be a massively bigger turnout than the PPP. Traditionally, election officials have been able to take that into account as they plan for their election, and frankly, I think they should be able to. You know, we don't want a law that ignores that reality. So my point

is I think -- I think the law needs looking at from a legislative perspective, and, you know, that's something we can work on, you know, over across the street, but as for the rule that's in front of us today, we basically have, you know, a few options, and we can -- I'm open to discuss all of them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The rule we posted deals with the kind of early It lets you count early voting machines towards election day. The benefit of that rule is it does basically help counties more -- be able to comply with the rule. The number of voting machines that we're -- that the State is providing to the counties is sufficient to meet the one to 250 ratio. I think one that we'll have to -- that we'll be looking at as a State throughout this year is now that we're going to a precinct scan optical scanning system, it's going to require some changes. average precinct size in Georgia is about 2500. That's -that size is fine. There are some precincts that are much, much bigger than that, and with the DRE system, you could do that. With a precinct-based scanning system, we've done some calculations, and the real issue is about throughput, basically, getting voters through the scanner, and that's a step that we're adding.

So I basically say all that to say that's all the things the rules working group is considering as we try to

solve this issue. Where we have it right now, I would say, is there's not a very good solution, and I'm kind of left with I think we need to look at what this law should be.

And so, basically, for the Board today, there's the rule we posted -- that we posted. We can adopt that and kind of continue to work. There's the rule that we -- the amended rule that we're proposing about subtracting electors. As Ms. Eveler brought up, -- I think she's correct -- that would -- that makes sense in a general election, a November general election. It doesn't make as much sense -- so basically, what that would mean is in a really small turnout election, like a special election, then kind of we have to have more equipment provided than in a large turnout election. So it's not really a -- it doesn't get to the aim of ensuring that voters don't have to wait in a long line.

**MR. RAFFENSPERGER:** Okay.

MR. GERMANY: I don't -- I don't have a good recommendation, but I'm happy to take any questions or comments from the Board.

MS. LE: Did the working group consider -- what did the working group and the counties thoughts of historical -- you know, I'm just concerned. My biggest concern is the definition of elector in the code book. I know it

just seems like we're taking the rule to make a practical application, but the elector as defined in the code book is pretty clear. But we're trying to find a practical solution, and I actually like the reason for it. I'm just concerned about number one, are we changing the legislative intent from that standpoint or are we considering — the working group — in terms of the anomalies, you know, historically a certain percentage shows up? Is there a range of plus or minus within that that accounts for or just leave it up to the counties to decide well, historically 25% so they're going to reduce it accordingly?

2.2

MR. GERMANY: I think you have to leave it up to the counties. Ms. Bailey and I discussed that. This year, there's a presidential preference primary that, you know, the real kind of race is on the Democrat -- who's going to be the Democratic candidate? Ms. Bailey said, you know, in Richmond County they're -- they're a heavily Democratic county, so they're going to expect a lot of voters. A heavy Republican county might not expect so many voters. And so, I don't -- I don't think there's a good way for us as a Board, you guys as a Board to do that or us as a State, but, you know, that's -- to try to answer your question, the proposed rule that I have in front of me that we were considering for amending defines electors as

used in OCGA 21-2-367 (b).

2.2

MS. LE: Narrowly adjusted that --

MR. GERMANY: So we're not trying to change it for
the whole code, just for that one --

MS. LE: -- and I get that.

MR. WORLEY: And if I -- Mr. Secretary, if I could --

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Sure.

MR. WORLEY: -- speak to some of the discussions that were had in the working group. I had a concern that the rule as first drafted, which tried to calculate the number of voting booths or enclosures available in the county that might have been voted on already, was not really practical for large counties as has been discussed because it would allow a county like Fulton County to put as few as one machine in a voting booth -- I'm sorry, in a precinct and that that was just, you know, obviously not correct. The other concern that we had was that the statute says what the statute says: 250 voters per machine, essentially, and that we really couldn't vary that -- that that would require the General Assembly to pass a new statute.

And so, we came up with this compromise that defines electors as all those people who have not already voted on election day, so the county essentially gets credit for the fact that they have allowed early voting, that those

people will not be coming back to vote on election day, and so you don't have to have an excess of machines for -- beyond what the statute requires for voters who are not going to be appearing on election day. And I think the feeling in the working group -- Ms. Sullivan could testify to this or not -- was that this was a good compromise to both adhere to the legislative intent and be practical for counties to work with.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

It's a very clear rule of thumb. As amended, the rule would be very simple. It would just say as used in OCGA 21-2-367 (b), the term electors shall mean those electors on the official list of electors for the precinct who have not voted as of election day. Polling places with assigned electors from more than one precinct shall use the total number of electors assigned to the polling place when calculating the minimum number of voting booths or enclosures. So I think -- I think this is a good -- a good compromise. It is true that this means that the counties will put out too many ballot-marking devices in the presidential primary, and they'll probably put more than are absolutely necessary in the general primary in May, but that's a distinction that the legislature did not make, and I think -- I think the revised language, as I said, is the best way to meet the legislative intent and be practical for the counties. Thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: Mr. Worley accurately stated and well stated the discussion of the working group.

2.2

MR. GERMANY: I would add a couple of things if that's all right, Mr. Chairman. One, and I think this could, you know, help the counties, is the statute talks about voting booths or enclosures. It doesn't talk about electronic ballot markers. We already have, you know, in the rules we've passed -- the rules we've just adopted a provision where a county election superintendent can in their discretion decide hey, if this line is too long, you know, we can start using emergency paper ballots. So conceivably they could have it -- they could do something where they have additional voting booths, but not machines in those booths, so basically, they hold for use if needed. You know, if we're going to what the legislature intended, you know, it's about voting booths or enclosures.

The other thing that I think Ms. Eveler pointed out 
- the second sentence in our proposed amendment basically
says -- it kind of changed what the legislature did too.

The legislature said precincts. Ms. Eveler is asking that
we basically leave it at precincts, and I think that would
help the counties too, and I think maybe what we should do
is maybe take out that sentence, post it subtracting some
electors who have already voted, I think provides some

assistance to the counties, and then, basically work to see if it's a statute that should be clarified and how we should do that, taking into account the fact that one ratio for every election, you know, is probably not the best way to go about it.

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: So just to clarify, I think what I'm hearing is that what we've posted, we don't want to move forward on that.

MR. GERMANY: I think that accurately kind of describes where the rules working group is.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. Would we make to take a motion on that to kill it or if we just don't approve it, it just dies on the vine.

MR. GERMANY: I would say it just dies on the vine.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Okay. So then what we have before us is the red letter outline right here, but what you're actually proposing is to tweak it further. And before we get to that point, what I would -- because we are moving relatively expeditiously, I assume that since Ms. Bailey from Richmond County is on the working group that this is something that works for her area and the people that she's talked to. And then, the question that we really have is our large metro counties, is this something that I think they're -- do they feel that it would still need further tweaking? At the end of the day,

what we want to make sure is that we don't have long lines.

MR. GERMANY: That's right.

1.3

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: If you look -- read most papers that are put out, they talk about 30 minutes is kind of, like, the standard, and so, we understand that. So we want to make sure that we're moving people through the lines. That's very important, I think, for everyone involved to have a good voting experience. So to just get where we are, in other words, some of the counties may actually have more machines than they want to have because they say that people won't be there, but it's better to be on that side than on the other side where you don't have enough machines, and you have lines that are 45 minutes to an hour. And so, --

MR. GERMANY: I think that's -- I think that's right, and I think that is where we should be. I don't think that the number of voting machines and the lines are always sort of correlated. There's other reasons for lines. I think that's kind of the flaw in the statute. I think the point of the statute is to ensure that there's not long lines. A ratio of voting booths I don't really think is the best way to do that, and so, to answer your question, I think passing this rule helps the counties. I don't think any county is going to love it. I think -- I

guess they're not going to. But -- and the real flaw, I think Ms. Bailey pointed out and Ms. Eveler as well, it doesn't take into account the reality that not every election is the same. A -- a PPP is not the same as a November general election, and county election officials know that, and they take that into account. Having to spend time putting out extra machines --

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: I agree.

2.2

MR. GERMANY: -- might not really help in terms of getting the most people through in the most efficient way possible, and that's what every county officer that I know, that's what they want to do in every election. So -- sorry.

MR. WORLEY: I certainly appreciate what Mr. Germany is saying and what the county officials are saying, the ones who have commented on the revision, but I don't see any way around that at this point without getting the General Assembly to do something about the statute. And so, it seems it falls to us to come up with a rule that, you know, meets that requirement, but, you know, is practical. If we don't -- if we don't pass a rule, we won't, you know, they won't be able to take into account people who have already voted before election day, so I think -- I think the rule as in our booklets is the right way to go right now, and then we can look and see if that

needs to be changed or modified.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: I agree. To your point, are there any additional tweaks of this, or is this as is?

Did you -- I thought you offered --

MR. GERMANY: I would -- I would say --

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Where exactly --

MR. GERMANY: It was based on Ms. Eveler's comment that, you know, the second sentence -- the sentence basically in black in y'all's binder, polling places with assigned electors more than one precinct, you know, what we're saying there -- and I think it makes sense -- is that sometimes people, voters from more than one precinct, will vote in the same polling place. That occurs basically when -- if you have a -- polling places are not, you know, grow on trees, as county officials will tell you, and, you know, especially now, many counties are facing pressure from schools to not use schools as polling places due to basically safety -- safety concerns. So if you have a really good polling place, you know, sometimes people will use them -- you know, lot of parking, good accessibility, a lot of good space -- they'll use it for more than one precinct.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Well, so, what is the final wording that you would like to see us move forward with the motion?

MR. GERMANY: I would post -- I think we post the, basically, the first sentence as used in -- post for public comment and just kind of knowing that it's not a perfect solution really for anybody, but I think Mr. Worley pointed out, it's basically what we can do right now. As used in OCGA 21-2-367(b), the terms electors shall mean those electors on the official list of electors for the precinct who have not voted as of election day.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Period.

MR. WORLEY: And then take out the final sentence.

MR. GERMANY: Yes.

MR. WORLEY: I'm fine with that.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a motion or any further discussion?

MR. WORLEY: I would make a motion that we post for public comment rule 183-1-13-.01, minimum number of voting booths, that states as used in OCGA section 21-2-367(b), the term electors shall mean those electors on the official list of electors for the precinct who have not voted as of election day.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second?

MS. SULLIVAN: Second.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of posting rule 183-1-13-.01 as presented by Mr. Worley, please do so by signifying aye.

1	THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
2	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any opposed? Motion carries. It
3	will be posted.
4	UNIDENTIFIED MAN: Is there any way we could discuss
5	this? No?
6	MR. GERMANY: The next the next rule is rule 183-
7	1-1402. It deals with advance and absentee voting.
8	This is one similar to rule 12 that I would ask that we
9	adopt the rule that was posted last month, and then, we'll
10	I can go through these revisions based on the comments
11	and the rule working group review.
12	MR. WORLEY: I'll make a motion that we adopt rule
13	183-1-1402, advance voting, as posted at our last
14	meeting.
15	MR. GERMANY: And, Mr. Worley, I would just ask that
16	it it also contains other sections in chapter 14.
17	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: It has
18	MR. WORLEY: Oh, excuse me. I'm sorry. Then I would
19	revise that. Yeah. I would make a motion then that we
20	adopt rule 183-1-1402,
21	MS. SULLIVAN: They're listed on your agenda.
22	MR. WORLEY: 183-1-1411, 183-1-1412, and13
23	as adopted from posting at our last meeting.
24	MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second?
25	MS. SULLIVAN: Second.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have discussion on the rules that were previously posted as a motion before us? Hearing none, all those who approve those rule changes as presented by Mr. Worley please do so by signifying aye.

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

2.2

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any opposed? Motion carries.

MR. GERMANY: Next, I'll go through the proposed amendments to post to the -- to those rules. The first one reflects basically kind of through a typo, and the GMA and some cities brought this to our attention in comments that cities and municipalities will still be able to use hand-marked paper ballots for advance voting. This -- this rule mistakenly implied that they wouldn't be able to, so we're proposing to fix that. This makes some similar changes that we made in chapter 12 about posting advance voting locations not just on the webpage but on the county's -- the county board of elections homepage to kind of try to account for the fact that it doesn't get lost. It's easier to find for people.

This makes some additional similar changes that were in chapter 12 based on the Matt Bernhardt study from the University of Michigan that the real intervention that is shown to be helpful is at the polling place scanner, telling people to review their paper ballot at that point, so we put that in a rule. We also add in here, as in

chapter 12, that -- this is based on some observations from the pilot county, from the pilot county in November - - that the poll officers stationed at the scanner should not be the person who is also dealing with questions of people at the ballot-marking devices, so it clarifies that there needs to be a different person who is basically assigned to the enclosed space to deal with voters, so that that the person at the scanner can stay at that station.

2.2

And that is one thing, and I know, Secretary, you brought this up earlier this week, in that I do think there are going to be additional poll workers needed for this year, just like there was when we moved for the first time to the new system. And I know counties recognize that as well, so that's a process that's underway to help them recruit. You know, anybody who wants to volunteer to be a poll worker with all the people here interested in elections, it's a great way to get involved. So there's - we would do that. It clarifies some options that if a voter -- if there's an error, what a county does and how they document that, whether or not the machine brings up the wrong ballot or if there's an error on the printed paper ballot.

And then, another substantive change is in the rule that we just adopted, the county has to give -- there's

basically a period -- HB316 passed a requirement that allows voters whose signatures don't match on an absentee ballot or who forget to sign their absentee ballot to have a process to cure that -- that mistake. And the proposed rule dealt with okay, basically after early voting ends, the counties need to get those rejection notices out ASAP, next day. In speaking with some commenters and some counties, there's a proposal to basically back that up all the way through the second Friday before the election, so an absentee ballot comes in, the second Friday or later, the county needs to get out a rejection notice the next day.

There was some concern in the working group that is that workable for the counties, especially large counties who might get thousands of absentee ballots in a day? The initial reaction from the largest, from Fulton County, was we think that's doable, and so I think it certainly should be a goal, and if they think it's doable, then, you know, I think it would be good practice. That's kind of the last substantive change we'd be posting for public comment today.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: So we have before us the copy of the proposed new rule with revisions. We've had a chance to review that. Do we have any comments, any questions for Mr. Germany?

I would just comment, Mr. Secretary, MR. WORLEY: that the comments that we've received were very good and thoughtful, and we have endeavored to adopt those or make sure that the rules reflected those, most importantly, that instructions to review the ballot will be given at the end of the process before it's deposited in the scanner, which the studies show is most effective, and I am especially pleased with the revisions for these rules in the notifications relating to absentee ballot rejections. That period is which that has to occur is very clear. The counties are very clearly instructed what they need to do that they need to try to reach out in addition to mailing by phone or email to end that process, and I think it's a very, very great improvement in our rules, so I'm very much in favor of these revisions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Also, I'd like to commend the working group. I know you've put an awful lot of hours into this. You've had a lot of input from everyone, but you've really been working hard to really perfect, you know, what we're trying to do. It's still a work in progress. We are open to taking more, obviously, input. We'll have some more rules posted today, but at this time I guess we're ready for a motion on that section, if you'd like to. Does anyone want to make a motion?

MR. WORLEY: Sure. I will. I make a motion that we

adopt for public posting and public comment the revised rule 183-1-14-.02 on advance voting, the revised rule 183-1-14-.11 on mailing admissions of ballots -- well, that wasn't actually revised, so we don't need to do that, but -- so let me start over. I'm sorry.

I make a motion that we adopt the revised rules for posting and public comment rule 183-1-14-.02 on advance voting and 183-1-14-.13 on prompt notification of absentee ballot rejection.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second?

MS. SULLIVAN: Second.

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a discussion on the motion? All those in favor of posting 183-1-14-.02 and 183-1-14-.13 as outlined by Mr. Worley, please do so by signifying aye.

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any opposed? Motion carries.

MR. GERMANY: The final rule that we posted last time is chapter 183-1-15-.02, definition of a vote. We don't have any proposed amendments to that rule, so I would ask that the Board adopt the rule as posted last month.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do you believe that clears up some of the questions that were raised today in the public comment phase? I think some of the speakers today were asking about, you know, clearing up exactly what is the

1 vote. 2 MR. GERMANY: I believe it does. 3 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have any discussion from 4 any members of the Board? Hearing none, is this time for 5 a motion? I move to adopt rule 183-1-15-.02, 6 MS. SULLIVAN: 7 definition of a vote, as was originally posted. 8 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have a second? 9 MR. WORLEY: Second. 10 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Do we have any further 11 discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of adopting 12 183-1-15-.02, please do so by signifying aye. 13 THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 14 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any opposed? Motion carries. 15 Okay. 16 MR. GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 MR. RAFFENSPERGER: I think that concludes our 18 business. Does anyone have any other business to bring 19 before the Board today? 20 MR. WORLEY: I don't have any other business, but I 21 did want to point out for the visitors in the audience 22 that -- who had not had a chance to see these rules yet, 2.3 they will be posted in the next day or so, that the changes that were adopted today have made some significant 24

improvements in the rules that we passed a month ago

25

namely empowering voters to verify their paper ballot in a way that strengthens the audit integrity, to promote a consistent and fair treatment of provisional voters, to preserve the intent of HB316 with respect to the number of voting machines, to increase election administrative transparency and engender public confidence, and to provide for a defined number of emergency ballots in every precinct in the state. I think these are all good changes. I think there are other changes that can be made based on the comments that we've received, and I know the members of the Board and the working group are certainly going to be looking at those -- continuing to look at those as the process of installing and operating the new voting system goes forward.

2.2

2.3

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: Any other members like the comment? Well, I'll just conclude with saying thank you to everyone that's here today. Also, I see sitting, my good friends our county election officials, and so I think we're learning today maybe from the county perspective on the number of machines we have in place. It may not be the perfect answer. I'll remind everyone we are in the legislative session. If we need to go back to the General Assembly, you know, we may have the time to do that, at least for elections going forward sometime, depending on when we move forward. Also, we will continue to have

1 discussions with everyone. I saw representatives from 2 ACCG, who represent the counties. We want to make sure 3 that they're, you know, brought into the process, and I 4 really -- I want to thank the people who offered their 5 positive and constructive comments today and also the 6 working group. I know how hard -- how much effort you all 7 put into this. You all have day jobs, so thank you very 8 much and with that we're adjourned. Do we need a motion? 9 Motion to adjourn. 10 MS. SULLIVAN: Second.

MR. WORLEY: Second.

MR. RAFFENSPERGER: All those in favor?

THE BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

(Meeting adjourned)

15

14

11

12

13

## CERTIFICATE

STATE OF GEORGIA COUNTY OF DEKALB

I, Kaitlin Walsh, Certified Court Reporter, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 4 through 89 constitute a true, correct and accurate transcript of the testimony heard before me, an officer duly authorized to administer oaths, and was transcribed under my supervision.

I further certify that I am a disinterested party to this action and that I am neither of kin nor counsel to any of the parties hereto.

In witness whereof, I hereby affix my hand on this, the 24th day of February, 2020.

Kaitlin Walsh, CCR, CVR CCR #: 5910-3132-3171-2256